

REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 19-21, and 23-35 of the present application remain pending. Claim 2 has been canceled herein without prejudice. Claims 1, 17, 19, 21, and 23 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, and 11-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Seager (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,561), hereinafter referred to as "Seager." The Applicants respectfully submit that these claimed embodiments of the present invention are not anticipated or suggested by Seager. Claim 1 of the present invention is directed to a handheld data processing device and recites (emphasis added):

wherein said first keypad slider and said second keypad slider substantially cover said display of said display/processor module when they are in a closed position

Claim 17 of the present invention is directed to a wireless telephone and recites (emphasis added):

wherein said microphone slider and speaker slider substantially cover said display when they are in a closed position

Claims 19 and 21 of the present invention are directed to a wireless telephone and recite (emphasis added):

wherein said microphone slider and speaker slider substantially cover a display of said data processing and transceiver module when they are in a closed position

Claim 23 is directed to a handheld display device and recites (emphasis added):

the covers are openable to protect a display disposed on said data processing unit when closed

Applicants respectfully submit that the recited claim limitation of sliding covers which substantially cover the display area and/or protect a display disposed on a processor/display module is neither taught nor suggested by Seager. For example, whether the main body members 20a and 20b of Seager are in an open or closed position, display 40, telephone control buttons 42, and telephone dialing buttons 44 remain totally exposed. Additionally, the Applicants respectfully submit that Seager does not teach or suggest that any components (e.g., display 40, telephone control buttons 42, and/or telephone dialing buttons 44) may be disposed on joining member 20c in any embodiment. Therefore, the slider components of Seager do not cover any display when open or closed. The embodiments of the present invention recite that the sliding components cover a display disposed on a processor/display module (e.g., processor/display module 100 of Figure 1). The Applicants respectfully submit that this claim limitation is not anticipated or suggested by Seager. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 1, 17, 19, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are overcome.

Claims 3-16 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 3-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are also overcome.

Claim 20 depends from independent Claim 19 and recite further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is also overcome.

Claims 24-35 depend from independent Claim 23 and recite further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 24-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are also overcome.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 10, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seager in view of Gray (U.S. Patent No. 5,440,629), hereinafter referred to as "Gray." As discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Seager does not teach the recited claim limitations of embodiments of the present invention.

While Gray may purport to teach sliders to cover a display, it nevertheless fails to teach sliders with keypads disposed thereon as recited in Claims 1, 17, 19, 21, and 23 of the present invention. Gray does not teach or suggest that end closure housing 48 or end closure housing 50 would ever comprise a keypad. Furthermore,

this claim limitation is not suggested by Gray because there is no need for a keypad on either slider 48 or slider 50 because of the telephone keys and buttons 22 that are disposed on chassis 12.

Gray teaches in column 2, lines 64-68 that a principle feature of the telephone handset is that it (emphasis added):

provides a protective enclosure especially for the key pad of the chassis from contact and impact by other objects in the environment and to protect the key pad from various contaminants to which it may be subjected during transportation and storage.

The Applicants respectfully submit that this teaches away from the claimed embodiments of the present invention in which the keypads are disposed over the display when in a closed position. As a result, the Applicants respectfully submit that Gray does not teach or suggest the claim limitations recited by embodiments of the present invention.

The Applicants respectfully further submit that motivation for combining the inventions of Gray and Seager according to the recited claim limitations is lacking because the disclosures of Seager and Gray teach away from each other. For example, if a principle feature of Gray's telephone handset is to, "protect the key pad from various contaminants to which it may be subjected," (column 2, lines 66-67) then it is counter-intuitive to combine Gray's handset with the radiotelephone of Seager which only shows the telephone control/dialing buttons on the outside of the handset. This combination exposes the key pad of Seager to the various contaminants which Gray seeks to protect against.

Furthermore, a combination of the disclosures of Gray and Seager would result in the telephone control/dialing buttons of Seager to be disposed on the end closure housings 48 and 50 of Gray. In so doing, the telephone control/dialing buttons would interfere with the earpiece 52 and mouthpiece 54 of Gray's telephone handset. Additionally, this would result in unnecessary duplication of the telephone dialing/control buttons and/or the display mechanism, neither of which are suggested by Seager or Gray. Because Seager's telephone handset is also used as a wristwatch, disposing the display 40, which is also used as Seager's timepiece (column 2, line 13), underneath the keyboard sliders would prove inconvenient for users when the apparatus is worn and operated as a wristwatch. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is insufficient motivation for realizing the claimed embodiments of the present invention in view of Seager in combination with Gray because these teachings are incongruent with each other.

Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the recited embodiments of the present invention are not anticipated by Seager or Gray alone or in combination. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 1, 17, 19, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

Claims 3-16 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 3-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

Claim 20 depends from independent Claim 19 and recites further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also overcome.

Claims 24-35 depend from independent Claim 23 and recite further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 24-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

With reference to the rejection of Claims 2, 10, and 28, Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claim 28 recites (emphasis added):

said first sliding cover is a keypad slider optically coupled to said display module

This is supported in page 15, line 19-page 16, line 2 of the specification which recite:

Drive current and signals generated by the keypad may be coupled to the display/processor 100 by a flexible ribbon connector or sliding contacts. Alternatively, signals between the sliders and display processor 100 may be optically coupled (e.g., a light emitting diode and detector pair).

The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Seager nor Gray teach or suggest optically coupling the slider components with the chassis to convey signals from the keypad. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsubstantiated by the cited art. The Applicants respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn or substantiated by art.

With reference to Claim 10, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 depends from Claim 1 and recites further claim limitations descriptive of an

embodiment of the present invention. As discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Gray. The Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment recited in Claim 1 with the additional limitation of including a voice recognition processor is not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Gray. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome.

With reference to Claim 35, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 35 depends from Claim 23 and recites further claim limitations descriptive of an embodiment of the present invention. As discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment of the present invention recited in Claim 23 is not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Gray. The Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment recited in Claim 23 with the additional limitation of including a line selection driver is not taught or suggested anywhere by Seager or by Gray. As described on page 16, lines 15-23 and page 17, lines 1-2, a line selection driver facilitates selecting commands for execution by the handheld device. In one embodiment, a user aligns the edge of the slider with the command to be selected. The command is selected by an appropriate input (e.g., a keystroke of contact with a touch panel display). The Applicants respectfully submit that this is not taught or suggested in either Seager or Gray. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is unsubstantiated by the cited art. The Applicants respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn or substantiated by art.

With reference to Claims 24 and 25, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 23 and recite further claim limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. The Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiment of the present invention recited in Claim 23 is not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Gray.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments recited in Claim 23 with the additional limitations of including a window in the first sliding cover and/or the second sliding cover, as recited in Claims 24 and 25 respectively, are not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Gray. As discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit that it would be counter-intuitive for Seager to dispose the display 40 under the sliding covers as that would degrade the utility of the invention when used as a wristwatch. Therefore, there is no need for the windows recited in Claims 24 and 25 as the display 40 of Seager is already visible. Additionally, there is no teaching or suggestion by Seager of an additional display disposed on member 20c. Additionally, Gray does not teach or recite a window in either of the end closure housings 48 and 50. Nor is there any motivation to add a window in end closure housings 48 and 50 as they cover a telephone keypad when closed. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

With reference to Claim 26, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 26 depends from Claim 23 and recites further claim limitations descriptive of an embodiment of the present invention. The Applicants respectfully assert that the

embodiment of the present invention recited in Claim 23 is not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Gray.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment recited in Claim 23 with the additional limitation of including display orientation controller is not taught or suggested by either Seager or Gray. The Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Seager or in Gray that teaches or suggests that either respective display is capable of displaying information in either a landscape orientation and a portrait orientation as recited in Claim 26 of the instant application. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsubstantiated by the cited art. The Applicants respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn or substantiated by art.

With reference to Claims 27, 29, and 30-34, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 27, 29, and 30-34 depend from Claim 23 and recite further claim limitations descriptive of an embodiment of the present invention. The Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiment of the present invention recited in Claim 23 is not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Gray.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments recited in Claims 27, 29, and 30-34 are not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Gray. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 27, 29, and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

With reference to Claim 4, the rejection states it would be obvious from referring to Seager to include a window in the second display slider in order to display multiple features on the second display. The Applicants respectfully submit that including a window in the second display slider in order to display multiple features on a second display is neither taught nor suggested by either Seager or Gray. For example, neither Seager nor Gray teach or suggest using more than one display and no motivation for more than one display is taught or suggested. Additionally, it would be redundant to utilize another display in addition to display 40 of Seager in the manner cited in the rejection. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that reason for combining Seager and Gray in as recited in Claim 4 is lacking. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsubstantiated by the cited art. The Applicants respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn or substantiated by art.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seager in view of Blonder et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,381,387), hereinafter referred to as "Blonder." The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Seager nor Blonder teach or suggest the claim limitations recited in Claim 21:

a microphone slider;
a data processing and transceiver module; and,
a speaker slider;
wherein one of said microphone slider and said speaker slider
comprises a keypad, and wherein said microphone slider and speaker slider
substantially cover a display of said data processing and transceiver module
when they are in a closed position; and
a voice recognition processor.

The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Seager not Blonder teach or suggest the claim limitation of a microphone slider and speaker slider substantially cover a display of said data processing and transceiver module when they are in a closed position recited in Claim 21.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiment of the present invention recited in Claim 21 is not taught or suggested by Seager alone or in combination with Blonder. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. The Applicants did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. 6,466,292, U.S. 5,889,236, U.S. 5,381,160.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date:

3/18/2004

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Anthony C. Murabito

Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060